



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/574,486 | 07/16/2007 | Yasuchika Takei | TAKEI 54 | 9144 |

1444 7590 01/06/2009
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
624 NINTH STREET, NW
SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

GUTMAN, HILARY L

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

3612

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

01/06/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

JAN 06 2009

Sheridan Neimark
BROWDY & NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
624 Ninth Street, NW
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20001-5303

December 29, 2008

In re Application of:
Yasuchika TAKEI et al.
Application No.: 10/574,486
Filed: July 16, 2007
Attorney Docket No. TAKEI – 54

**DECISION ON PETITION
UNDER 37 CFR 1.181**

This is in response to the petition filed on September 3, 2008 under 37 CFR 1.181 requesting the withdrawal of the finality of the Office Action mailed August 21, 2008 as being improper.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

Applicant alleges that the final rejection mailed August 21, 2008 is improper because claims 2 and 3 were not rejected on prior art, in the previous Office action mailed November 29, 2007 and instant claims 2 and 3 were merely amended to incorporate the limitations of cancelled claim 1 and eliminate the negative recitations identified by the examiner.

MPEP 706.07(a) sets forth that the second or any subsequent action on the merits shall be made final except where the examiner introduces a new ground of rejection that is neither necessitated by applicants' amendment nor based on information submitted in an information disclosure statement filed during the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p).

A review of the record reveals that claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph, for failing to further limit the base claim by reciting negative limitations in a first Office action on the merits mailed November 29, 2007. Furthermore, the examiner indicated that claims 2 and 3 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph and to include all the limitations of the base claim. In response to this Office action, applicant amended claims 2 and 3 to include the subject matter of original claim 1 and attempted to eliminate the negative limitations to overcome the 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph rejections.

In view of the fact that amended claims 2 and 3 were not rejected on any prior art in the first Office action on the merits, it is agreed that the new grounds of rejections were not necessitated by applicants' amendment.

The finality of the Office action mailed September 3, 2008, but not the action itself, is hereby withdrawn. The Office action of September 3, 2008 is now considered to be non-final and the shortened statutory period for response continues to run THREE (3) MONTHS from the date of mailing of the Office action.

SUMMARY: The petition is GRANTED.

Telephone inquiries should be directed to D. Glenn Dayoan, Supervisory Patent Examiner, at (571) 272-6659.



David J. Bagnell, Acting Director
Patent Technology Center 3600
(571) 272-5250

DGD/SM: 12/29/08

